UNITY

FREEDOM FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

Editors

John Haynes Holmes Francis Neilson

On the Defensive

By JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

Church Advertising

By CARLYLE SUMMERBELL

"Is Violence the Way Out of Our Industrial Disputes?"

Reviewed By JAMES WALDO FAWCETT

VOLUME LXXXVI NUMBER 19

Chicago, January 27, 1921

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

ESTABLISHED 1878

$3.00 PER ANNUM.

With THE FREE RELIGIOUS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, THE CONGRESS OF RELIGIONS, and all other organizations and individuals seeking to widen fellowship and to realize the Brotherhood of the Spirit unrimmed by creed, form or sectarian prejudices

EDITORS
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
FRANCIS NEILSON

ASSISTANT EDITOR
EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

Robert Collyer, Chicago. Wm. C. Gannett, St. Paul.
Jenkin Ll. Jones, Janesville. C. W. Wendte, Cincinnati.
J. C. Learned, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

Frances L. Roberts, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. Sunderland, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
Geo. W. Cooke, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS

Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Charles W. Casson
George Willis Cooke
Percy M. Dawson
Frank C. Doan
Charles F. Dole
James Waldo Fawcett
Zona Gale
Emil G. Hirsch
Chester Lloyd Jones
David Starr Jordan
George Grover Mills
Susan M. Quackenbush
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
Albert R. Vail
Arthur L. Weatherly
James H. West

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, CHICAGO, ILL.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

Sample Copies of UNITY Sent Upon Request

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. *and* Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor —large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

Contents:

EDITORIAL—

Notes.—J. H. H. 291
On the Defensive.—John Haynes Holmes 293

CONTRIBUTED—

Church Advertising.—Carlyle Summerbell 296
Will Progressives Unite?—Ernest M. Whitesmith 298
The Unity Calendar.—C. W. Casson 291

A BOOK A WEEK—

"Is Violence the Way Out of Our Industrial Disputes?"—
James Waldo Fawcett 299

POETRY—

Satan: 1920.—*Richard Le Gallienne* 296
The Virtuoso.—*Mabel J. Bourquin* 298
Revolution.—James Waldo Fawcett 299

THE FIELD—

A Protest Against Anti-Semitism 303
Appeal for Necessitous Unitarian Children in Buda Pesth 303

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOL. LXXXVI THURSDAY, JANUARY 27, 1921 NUMBER 19

THE UNITY CALENDAR.

SUNDAY—It is less the aim of religion to save souls than to make souls worth saving.
MONDAY—Eternal life is here, and the judgment day is now.
TUESDAY—No man can be in any kind of heaven so long as any other man is in any kind of hell.
WEDNESDAY—If you fall today, it will not be because you have not the power to stand erect.
THURSDAY—Remember, the only heaven you will ever get into you will bring in with you.
FRIDAY—Any good thing is sin, if anything better can be done with the same time and energy.
SATURDAY—Why look out on truth through the bars of a creed, when you might stand in God's open?

C. W. CASSON.

The latest news offered for the delectation of a world that seeks for peace, and fought a four-years war to gain it, is the announcement of the testing by the French and Belgians of a "super-long range gun, estimated to be able to fire a shell 200 miles." The German "big Bertha" is apparently outdone! A further interesting bit of information is the statement of the Chicago *Tribune* correspondent that the "French and Belgian military authorities are endeavoring to keep the particulars of this weapon secret." It is true, to be sure, that Article VIII of the Covenant of the League of Nations, to which both France and Belgium have subscribed, expressly pledges the signatories to inform each other concerning armaments. But as a notorious American politician is reported once to have said, "What is the Constitution between friends?" It surely is a Simple Simon who believes that the nations have any intention of living up to any such agreement as that contained in Article VIII when it is to their advantage not to do so! One would think that the Hague Conferences had taught the world the utter and perpetual futility of trying to control, restrict and publicize the weapons of international war. With armaments, exactly as with drugs, alcoholic liquors and prostitution, nothing is efficacious but abolition. When we get a league of nations which provides that present armaments shall be scrapped, and all new armament building be forbidden, we shall know that at last we have something that is worth while.

Discussion of armaments leads us to emphasize the fact that there has seldom been a more propitious time for pushing the agitation for disarmament than the present hour. Indeed, it may be said that if we cannot "put over" the disarmament program now, we can never hope to do so. The people are sick of the horrors and sacrifices of war. They are completely disillusioned as regards the consequences of the Great War. They are in no mood and have no means to pay the vast expenditures involved in maintaining modern armies and navies. Above all, they see the fallacies of the old preparedness argument. Now is the time, therefore, to strike! We should back what seems to be President-elect Harding's idea that a conference of the nations should be called to the one end of arranging a program for disarmament. We should support Senator Borah's resolution providing for a naval holiday for five years by agreement between America, England and Japan. These failing, we should sustain the bill introduced by the Illinois Representative providing for the disarmament of the United States regardless of the action of other Powers. And always, of course, we should talk and educate; the popular mind is plowed for the sowing, and the seeds should not be lacking. What the diplomats failed to do at Paris, the people may still do —more easily and quickly on this disarmament question, perhaps, than on any other. UNITY is only sorry that it has not a million readers, to help on this great movement of emancipation.

The abolition of armaments raises at once the still more fundamental question of the abolition of war. It is strange that more people do not understand what is involved in this statesmanlike proposal. It is no vain hope that some magic wand can be found, by the raising of which war can be made to disappear suddenly and forever. It is simply the suggestion, first, that by international agreement war may be defined, along with piracy and dueling, as a *crime*, to be duly punished as such whenever committed under any circumstances; and secondly, that a court may be established for the settlement by judicial process of all disputes between nations. The abolition of war means simply the extension to the national field of exactly that method of constructive change which has ended duelling between individuals. Or, still better, it means the establishment internationally of that relation which inheres between states of the United States. The trouble is now that war is legally and morally the accepted method of vindicating national honor, defending national rights, etc. It is regarded, under circumstances always convincing to the war-making nation, which is of course always the judge of its own case, as not only a proper but an honorable procedure. What is needed, there-

fore, is the degradation of war under all circumstances to the status of a crime, and the nation declaring war to the status of a criminal. This would inevitably make war to be, like piracy, a dishonorable thing; and the creation of a whole new public opinion on the question, an immediate certainty.

UNITY has been refusing all along to regard seriously the reports which come to us from the Southern States in regard to the revival of the Ku Klux Klan, of odious memory. We have been taking it for granted that the "days of Mumbo-Jumbo," as the *New Republic* puts it, were over. Signs are beginning to multiply, however, that the revamped Klan is no joke. In spite of all its preposterous hocus-pocus symbolism, it seems to be gathering real strength in the South, and at least spreading terror among the whites, if not among the blacks. The latest evidence of the real menace which may be involved in the situation is revealed in an office of the American Express Company on Third Avenue, in New York City. Exhibited in the window, is a large poster entitled "American Express Bulletin," bearing a picture of a knight of the Ku Klux Klan taking an oath. Beside the picture appear the words, "Here country, home and Klan stand together," and "The American flag and the Fiery Cross are always found side by side" (as they are in the picture)! The purpose of the whole thing appears in a statement that American Express Money Orders may be sent as contributions to the cause. We have not seen this poster ourselves, but it has been described to us from personal observation by a careful reporter, who winds up her description with the words, "Isn't it damnable?" It surely is! It is lamentable, indeed criminal, to attempt to throw the Negro question back into the period of abominations which followed upon our reconstruction days. We are certain that the Negroes are today too well educated to be stampeded by any such bunkum as lies at the heart of the Klan movement. We hope also that the whites are too sensible to be fooled by it.

In discussing the revival of the Ku Klux Klan, it might be well to emphasize that others than the Negroes should be interested in the projected movement. Thus, it is announced that the Klan will refuse to receive as members not only Negroes, but also Jews and Catholics. The purpose of this secret organization, in other words, is directed quite as much against those who are not able to meet the superior standards of Protestant Christianity as against those who are so unfortunate as to be born with black skins! The Klan is obviously intending to revive not only the racial intolerance of post-reconstruction days, but also the mad persecuting spirit of medievalism. Its plan is to gather up within itself every prejudice and raging hatred of our time. Negroes, Catholics, Jews, Socialists, Communists, radicals of every stripe—all these are to be banished from the exclusive circle of true Americanism, and thus cast into outer darkness! In a way this is fortunate, for it will tend to bring inevitably to the side of the Negroes the combined force of all these various groups which we have named. May it not also be hoped that there will appear at least a remnant of old-fashioned Americans who still believe in liberty, tolerance and goodwill as the sacred talismans of life, and would save this country from the sweeping scourge of such ancient and alien cruelties as are here involved? Let the Ku Klux Klan push this crusade to the uttermost. The harder it works and the more noise it makes, the surer will be the tide of resentment which will sweep it away into the oblivion where it belongs.

At the late Boston meeting of the Federal Council of Churches, great interest was aroused by a report of a delegate from Denver, on the experience of the Denver churches in the street car strike which convulsed that city last summer. When the battle between the railroad company and its employes had produced within a few days a distressing condition of tumult, violence and bloodshed, a group of business men sent out a hurry call to all the churches in Denver, asking that the pastor and one layman from each church attend a meeting for purposes of conference on the strike. There was an almost unanimous response from Protestants, Catholics and Jews; and from the very first, the meeting rose above all considerations of sect and creed and gave itself exclusively to the consideration of the public welfare. Already, before this meeting had gathered, the strike had proved a failure, and the church forces were therefore unable to exert any conciliatory influence upon the situation. But there and then they resolved to investigate the whole affair, and to this end appointed a so-called Denver Commission of Religious Forces. The Denver delegate, in reporting this event to the Federal Council, described this action as the most notable co-operation of religious people to grapple with an industrial problem, which any American city had yet seen. Before endorsing this opinion, it may be well to wait until the report of the Commission on its inquiry into the strike has been published to the world. We have seen so-called religious people interest themselves before this in labor troubles, only to denounce the workers in specious pleas of opposition to violence and attacks upon the general public. It may be, however, that we shall have in this case in Denver, a repetition of what took place in the case of the investigation of the Steel Strike

by the Inter-Church World Movement. If so, we shall indeed have a notable instance of what churches can do in the service of the community.

When doctors disagree, what is the poor layman to do? Prof. Carlton J. Hayes of Columbia University, in his "A Brief History of the Great War," refers to the enhanced prestige of the Catholic Church, which, he says, "was ably guided during the Great War and remained true to its high ideals" (page 410). Mr. H. G. Wells, on the other hand, touching on this same subject in his "The Outline of History," takes quite a different view:

"The world war of 1914-1918," he writes, "was a unique opportunity for the Papacy; the occasion was manifest for some clear strong voice proclaiming the universal obligation to righteousness, the brotherhood of men, the claims of human welfare over patriotic passion. No such moral lead was given. The Papacy seemed to be balancing its traditional reliance upon the faithful Hapsburgs against its quarrel with republican France." (Volume II, page 167.)

In balancing these diverse judgments, the one against the other, we are inclined to feel that the truth lies midway between the two. As compared with the various Protestant churches of the world, the record of the Catholic Church during the War was one of exalted courage and fidelity. It refused to prostitute the Christian gospel to the partisan purposes of war, plead consistently for mercy and goodwill, and lost no opportunity to work for peace. Rome was the only church of Christendom to come out of the War unstained with blood and unspoiled by hate. On the other hand, however, we have always felt that the Papacy underestimated its moral power in such a crisis, and thus missed opportunities to end the struggle by a display of decisive spiritual authority. We would have had the Pope put his ban upon the War at the very outset, forbid all Catholics in all countries to take up arms, and excommunicate every member of the church, from the Austrian Emperor down, who ignored his command. Whether such action would have stopped, or ended the conflict, no one can say. But it would at least have thrown the belligerent countries into endless confusion, made the war desperately unpopular with great numbers of men, and broken in the end all military morale. As for the Church, it would have gained so high a degree of spiritual prestige, that all such doubt as is indicated by the diverse opinions of Prof. Hayes and Mr. Wells, would be impossible.

It is refreshing to find a denominationalist who is ready to stand up and defend the denominational idea in religion. The average Christian, especially of the liberal persuasion, will publicly plead for the unity of Christendom and deplore the present separation of church from church, sect from sect, and at the same time give all his energies to the service of that particular branch of Protestantism to which he belongs. It is seldom that a religious leader is honest enough these days to profess in theory the actual practice of his life. Hence the satisfaction of finding a man like Rev. Eugene R. Shippen, well-known Unitarian minister of Boston, who dares to stand up and be counted as one who believes in the existence of separate and competitive denominations. "There are those," he says, "who look upon denominations as the bane of Christendom, almost as the denial of Christanity." To this indictment he enters a vigorous demurrer:

"Denominations," he declares, "are the life of Christianity. The church, like the body, functions in and through its parts. . . . When Protestantism started on its career of differentiation, sect following sect, this was the beginning of a new and better day. Consciously or unconsciously, America is today extolling separatism in celebrating the Pilgrim separatists."

He thereupon proceeds to deplore the present-day emphasis "upon uniformity, upon standardism, upon the one church idea," and denounces this "as impractical as it is unintelligent." Here is a frank statement of the opposition case which we welcome. It is hypocrisy, camouflage, apologetic deceit which we hate, and never honest difference of opinion. We believe that Mr. Shippen is wrong, that the very illustration which he uses of the body acting through its parts is the answer to his belief, as witness the familiar passage from St. Paul. But he has said honestly and openly what most men deliberately conceal.

On the Defensive

During a long period of convalescence and vacation in the summer of 1920, I enjoyed the rare privilege of attending church services and sitting not in the pulpit but in the pew. For nearly three months, I went regularly on Sunday morning to church—at most of the time to union services conducted at a summer resort on the Maine coast—and listened attentively to the sermons of a great variety of clergymen. I heard Unitarians, Baptists, Episcopalians, Congregationalists and Presbyterians; I heard young men and old men, preachers distinguished and undistinguished, country ministers and city ministers, a college town clergyman, a president of a university, a dean of a theological seminary, and a bishop of a western state. Some of these men were orthodox, and some liberal, in belief; most of them had ability, although in varying degrees; all of them, without exception, were sincere, high-minded and devoted. Together they constituted as representative a group of preachers as could easily be encountered by a church-goer; and their preaching was without question typical of the pulpit utterances of our time.

Very early in my somewhat novel experience as a "hearer of the word only," I began to notice a

certain interesting but disquieting feature which seemed to be characteristic of the sermons to which I was listening. As Sunday followed upon Sunday, this common factor became more and more conspicuous, until today, when I look back upon my many hours in the pews, it stands out as my one most vivid memory. These preachers whom I heard differed from one another in all kinds of ways, as we have seen. In age, in experience, in denominational connection, in local environment, in theological opinion, they presented a wide variety of character. But in one thing at least, they were well nigh identical. In their preaching, as mouthpieces of the church and witnesses to truth, they were men who were *"on the defensive."* They spoke as those who knew that they were under attack, and serious attack; and most of them as men who felt, consciously or unconsciously, that this attack could not be successfully resisted. These preachers seemed to think it their duty to defend, to justify, to vindicate. Through their utterances sounded the note of apology; and in the spirit even of the best of them, was the unescapable suggestion of embarrassment and alarm. If they spoke of the Bible, it was to concede that the book was not regarded or read as it used to be, but that it was a valuable piece of literature all the same. If they spoke of Jesus, it was to ask the congregation to put aside all question of his divine origin and character, and discuss him at his lowest terms, so to speak, as a teacher of morals and religion. If the miracles forced themselves upon attention, it was to agree that they were now impedimenta and not wings to the Gospel, and to explain them away as disguised naturalistic phenomena, or to plead that there might be something in them after all. If the church was discussed, it was to bewail its present plight, to berate the careless world which ignored or denied its mission, and to present the pious hope that the day would come when mankind would recognize its errors and repent. Not always, of course, in all the sermons delivered, was this the attitude taken or the spirit manifested. We remember with abounding gratitude one of our preachers who cast not a look askance in any direction, but with clear eyes set bravely to the front, offered his message without apology. But the prevailing note was exactly that which I have just described. These men were "defenders of the faith" in an age when the "faith" had become so tenuous a thing as scracely to be worth fighting for any more. They seemed to be under a common compulsion to explain why they were in the pulpit, and to beg pardon of the congregation for saying the things they were about to say. Even the matter of time was a constant bugaboo. Almost invariably these preachers assured their auditors that they would discuss their subject "as briefly as possible"; and in most cases they lived up to their timid promise.

From experience such as this, continued through many weeks, under circumstances exceptionally typical in character, one learns to appreciate how terrific has been the assault of the modern mind upon the traditional tenets and practices of Christianity, and how successful has been this assault in beating down even the best defences of the church. Today there is nothing left of what once seemed to rise, like the rock of Gibraltar, out of the very substance of the universe, and to stand impregnable. It is no unwonted thing for religion to be attacked, and for the ministers of religion to stand stanchly "on the defensive." Unbelievers have aways been numerous and usually aggressive. But there was a time when these unbelievers had to justify themselves, prove their case, even plead for a hearing. They were outlaws of public opinion, and as such they had to demonstrate their right to exist. Now, however, the situation is reversed. It is the church which has to beg to be heard, and its priests who have to apologize for living. To be "on the defensive" is nothing new, for truth must ever have its champions against error. But to be "on the defensive" with something to defend, is one thing; and to be "on the defensive" with nothing to defend, is another and quite different thing. This is the plight of the average Christian minister of our time. This is the reason why he is timid, embarrassed, apologetic. He is expected to stand up and deliver a message, and he discovers that the message committed to him by his office is one which the public recognizes only to ridicule or denounce. He has credit to maintain—and he finds that the coin he has to offer is so debased as no longer to be acceptable on the intellectual and spiritual exchanges of the world. His bulwarks are down—his garments stripped from his body. And he knows it—that is, if he be intelligent and honest! To the very extent, in other words, that a minister is a modern man, he is professionally out of touch with his age. Only as a beggar is he recognized at all—and then only in the spirit of pity, or of "auld lang syne."

But this is not the whole of the story! The assault of the modern age upon the church has been terrific, and it has been successful; but this does not necessarily mean that the churches and their ministers, unless they themselves would obstinately have it so, are defeated, or must even continue to stand "on the defensive." It is true that men will no longer accept the Bible as literally the inspired word of God, and therefore as the guide of thought and conduct; that they will no longer receive the church as the sole repository or even medium of divine truth; that they will no longer regard Jesus as the Son of God, who died for the atonement of man's sin; that they will no longer believe in God as a

transcendental personal deity, nor pray to him for compassion or favor; that they will no longer take seriously the creeds, the old modes of worship, or even the traditional standards of Christian conduct. But what do these refusals signify? A rejection of religion? Not at all! They signify a rejection of certain long accepted and deeply reverenced ideas of religion, because these have been discovered by candid minds to be no longer consistent with truth; but they do not touch in the remotest degree, much less destroy, the basic reality of religion itself. This fact of religion is as fundamental today as at any time in the past. Men are as eager to lay hold on vital religious thought, and to undergo genuine religious experience, as they have ever been. What they will not do is to accept, under the guise, and because of the need, of religion, a set of religious ideas which they know to be false. On the contrary, it is the very necessity of religion, interpreted in its best idealistic sense, which compels men to reject these ideas, and to seek new ideas which shall be as real an expression of the religious experience of the twentieth century man, as the Apostolic and the Nicene Creeds were of the religious experience of the fourth or fifth century man. And it is naturally enough to the churches that they look for the formulation and presentation of these new ideas. But these churches and their ministers, instead of welcoming this opportunity for change and advance, are content to sink back into meek defense of what they know to be unreal. The spirit of orthodoxy, the besetting sin of organized religion in liberal as well as so-called orthodox circles, has got them! They are content to be apologists, where they might be prophets!

How not to be "on the defensive," under conditions of assault such as those now beating down the churches, is illustrated by many great episodes of history. None is more remarkable than the story of the Catholic Church in the two centuries following the Reformation. It was with terrific suddenness that the attack which had long been preparing against the Papacy burst like a hurricane upon Europe in the opening years of the sixteenth century. Germany, France, Switzerland, Scotland, England, the Netherlands, even parts of Italy, were swept by the storm, and the ancient hierarchy apparently cast down in hopeless ruin. Never was there such ecclesiastical devastation in so short a space of time, and for such good reason. Wherever men imbibed the new learning and spirit of the Renaissance, they became intoxicated with new visions of religion. Wherever men were awakened to the moral appeal, they smote the corruption of Rome. Wherever men yearned for liberty, they took up arms against Papal tyranny. And kings, long chafing under the temporal power of the pontiffs, followed gladly the leadership of Reformers and the common people, and reared their thrones anew on the wreckage of the shattered hierarchy. Within a decade, Catholicism was everywhere "on the defensive"; but nowhere was she content to stay "on the defensive." The Reformation was followed promptly by the Catholic Revival, which was chiefly characterized by two remarkable events. The one was the famous Council of Trent, in which the Papacy assembled its wisest leaders, and made over the church, to meet the revolutionary exigencies of the times. The other was the Society of Jesus, or Jesuits, organized by Loyola, accepted and blessed by the Pope, and used as the army of attack against the legions of Protestantism. The moment that the Roman Church had found its new mind, it sent out these black-robed priests by the thousands and the tens of thousands, to preach the new message, and reclaim the lost children of Rome to their old allegiance. North, east, west, they went—to preach, to organize, to face persecution, to suffer death. With the result that Southern Germany, all of France, all of Italy, and twelve provinces of the Netherlands were recovered to the Papacy; the Catholics in England and Switzerland were rescued from hiding and given courage; Europe was safely divided between Catholic and Protestant, instead of becoming as it had threatened to become, all Protestant; and the church itself was cleansed and built anew. Thrown violently "on the defensive," Rome used the new thought, spirit and even purpose of the age to take the aggressive, and made herself thereby a freshly potent influence in human affairs.

It is this capacity for aggression and progress, this ability to turn defeat into victory, so strangely characteristic of our Catholic brethren, which seems to be sadly lacking in contemporary Protestantism. Our churches are supine, timid, concessive. At their worst they apologize and whine; at their best, they hardly do better than protest, or view with alarm. How seldom do they call to arms with trumpet blasts of confidence and cheer. And yet never was there such an opportunity for bold advance as there is today. Not even the early Christians, certainly not the Protestant Reformers, had any such chance for constructive workmanship, adventuring faith, creative spiritual leadership. Religion is as profound a reality as ever. If men have lost it, or seemed to lose it, it is because in the churches, which would seem to be its witness, they hear a language which is a jargon, meet ideas which are myths, behold practices which are superstitions, encounter codes of law which are immoral, and always a half-hearted defense of these patent antiquarian survivals. What men want and need, and the times therefore demand,

is a new theology, made of the thought and experience of the modern mind—a new mode of worship, at least as real to the modern heart as the crude rituals of patriotism—a new application of idealism, which shall give guidance to the modern soul in its battle against the injustice, cruelty and sin of civilization. We are lost today in a veritable welter of confusion. Old institutions and social customs are disappearing, like melting snow, before the hot blasts of destructive change which are beating upon mankind. The will of man, tortured, disillusioned, repentant, is stirred to its very depths with agony and fear. Nothing can hope to live, much less to serve, at such a time, which does not resolve to co-operate in making all things new, which is the stupendous task to which the race is setting itself this day. To be timid, apologetic, "on the defensive," is to avail nothing save to win the scorn of men. But to be aggressive and adventurous in proclamation of new hope, this is to bring in the Kingdom. Here and there are men who are abandoning the apologetic defense of things old and trite and dead, and seeking the new in exultant joy and triumphant faith. Such men, and the churches which they lead, are vital forces in society, and are proving that religion has as potent a sway over the lives of men as ever. When all have similarly abandoned crumbling altars, and trusted to the untrodden path and the open sky, the church will live again and God be once more present among men. "Speak unto my people, that they go forward"—this is still the divine word.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

SATAN: 1920.

I read there is a man who sits apart,
A sort of human spider in his den,
Who meditates upon a fearful art—
The swiftest way to slay his fellow men.
Behind a mask of glass he dreams his hell:
With chemic skill, to pack so fierce a dust
Within the thunderbolt of one small shell—
Sating in vivid thought his shuddering lust—
Whole cities in one gasp of flame shall die,
Swept with an all-obliterating rain
Of sudden fire and poison from the sky;
Nothing that breathes be left to breathe again—
And only gloating eyes from out the air
Watching the twisting fires, and ears attent
For children's cries and woman's shrill despair,
The crash of shrines and towers in ruin rent.

High in the sun the sneering airmen glide,
Glance at wrist-watches: scarce a minute gone
And London, Paris, or New York has died!
Scarce twice they look, then turn and hurry on.
And, far away, one in his quiet room
Dreams of a fiercer dust, a deadlier fume:
The wireless crackles him, "Complete success":
"Next time," he smiles, "in half a minute less!"

To this the climbing brain has won at last—
A nation's life gone like a shriveled scroll—
And thus To-Day outstrips the dotard Past!
I envy not that man his devil's soul.

Life. —*Richard Le Gallienne.*

CONTRIBUTED

Church Advertising

Church advertising is becoming one of the fascinating arts and sciences of the present day. It is such a subtle art that it intoxicates its worshippers, not permitting them to know that they are of its adherents. The minister with long coat and white tie often thinks his profession is too sacred to advertise, just as the priest and semi-priest button their collar behind instead of in front, all with a purpose.

Indeed, what is the steeple in the old-fashioned architecture of the church building except an advertisement? The Quaker's garb, the Mennonite bonnets, the Salvation Army base drum, all proclaim in their own way and their own time, the thought back of their creation and use. Some advertise by *proclaiming* the fact that they never advertise; others by refusing to join the common ways of publishing their wares to the public.

Advertisement is to become a part that is recognized of the future church—not the coy advertisement of the churchman that does not understand himself, but the conscious attempt to "adverto," turn the thoughts of men and women to the religion of the organization, and through that to unite the egos of the individual to the Soul of the Universe.

Among the strictest and most conservative orthodox today there is a conscious attempt to advertise their gospel. Notice the following Moody Church Tabernacle advertisement in a Chicago paper:

INTERDENOMINATIONAL

THE MOODY CHURCH TABERNACLE
Clark Street and North Avenue
Services 10:30 A. M. and 7:00 P. M.

DR. WILLIAM EVANS
a Bible teacher of international reputation, will preach.

MORNING SERVICE:
THE CHRISTIAN AND THE CROSS

EVENING SERVICE:
FACING THE PAST AND THE FUTURE

Special program by 40-piece Band and large Chorus Choir, 6:30 p. m.

RICHARD J. OLIVER, Director.
Lance B. Latham, Pianist

Serenade ..... King
Old Melodies ..... Foster
Solo by Howard Jones, Boy Cornetist

CHOIR

Sail On (by request) ..... Gabriel
The Palms (Band accompaniment) ..... Faure
Hallelujah for the Cross ..... McGranahan

Family Prayer Meeting, Wednesday, 7:30 P. M.

Or study the advertisement of a strictly denominational church like the Greater Immanuel Church of Chicago, which reaches so many people in different ways:

BAPTIST

The Church which meets every human need without Delay
Wonderful Sundays at the

GREATER IMMANUEL CHURCH
2320 Michigan Ave.

Come see. Come enjoy.

Sunday school ..... 9:30 a. m.
Morning worship ..... 11:00 a. m.
Grand concert at ..... 4:00 p. m.

The Columbia School of Expression, located at 3358 S. Michigan Ave., assisted by the Immanuel Band, will provide the program.

Luncheon at 5:30 p. m.
Moving pictures at 6 p. m.
Meeting of the Young Peoples' Evening Club, Adult Prayer Circle, and Juniors at 6:45 p. m.
Everybody's service at 7:45 p. m.

JOHNSTON MYERS
will preach

This Baptist Church looks after the preaching, the music by a "Grand Concert," luncheon and moving pictures. That is, it appeals not only to the ear, but to the eye and the stomach. The Catholic church knows its psychology better than the Protestant, and it always appeals by its architecture, its statues, its sacred smells, its pictures, and its drama of the Mass, to the whole of the worshipper. The emphasis of the Reformers upon logic and the metaphysics of the creeds, will die a hard and painful death.

The Presbyterian church, the most dignified of this group, is beginning to advertise something beside the sermon taken from the Jewish scriptures upon the *sabbath-day*. Note this advertisement and how it is written:

PRESBYTERIAN

8 p. m.—Why the Puritans Persecuted Witches and Quakers.

TIMELY TOPICS:

1. What the Nobel Prizes Accomplish.
2. Why Did the Greeks Recall the Teuton Loving Constantine?

11 a. m.—"JUST WILLING"

REV. JOSIAH SIBLEY, D.D.,
MINISTER

SECOND PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
Michigan Ave. and 20th St.

A Downtown Church Within Your Reach.
Exceptionally Fine Music

The Christian Science church is an adept of advertising, and in its organization uses the methods of the efficiency of big business. Its advertisements of its churches, after advertising every church of its own in the city, the subject of that Sunday and the location of the reading room connected with the church, closes as follows:

The above sixteen Churches are branches of The Mother Church, The First Church of Christ, Scientist, in Boston, Massachusetts.

Its wonderful success in gaining adherents is based upon the wrong diagnosis of physicians, its treatment of psychotherapeutics, and its insistence of its efficiency for the health of the body. So long as most orthodox Protestants ignore the body, and physicians refuse to admit the treatment of the mind for diseases of the nerves, Christian Science will flourish. They have an excellent daily paper, money, lecturers who go about all the time advertising Christian Science. It is a sort of patent medicine church, that is attacked by the drug stores and dope doctors, its unwilling advertisers.

As you approach many cities of America, you will notice that the highest location is occupied by a Roman Catholic church, whose stately architecture represents to the seeing eye the mysterious, of which semi-civilized man is yet afraid. It cares little about the logical steps of reason, but appeals largely to the emotions. Such is its hold upon the womanhood of America that it is almost impossible for a woman to escape the religion of her childhood. By its refusal to use the newspapers openly, it appeals to the dogma of never changing practice, and thus indirectly keeps advertising its claims of being different from other churches.

Protestantism with its divided constituency, its insistence on minute theological or organized differences, its social sectors, and its competition with its neighbors, is necessarily advertising its weaknesses. The collapse of the Inter-Church Movement after its brave start shows the inherent weakness of the intellectual dissent from wrong doctrines as being sufficient for the whole of man. The Protestant churches often have a large local following. The Peoples Church of Chicago is said to have the largest regular Protestant congregation. Here is one of its advertisements:

"JESUS vs. PAUL"

DR. PRESTON BRADLEY

THE PEOPLES CHURCH
Pantheon Theater 10:30 A. M.
Sheridan near Wilson

Notice that this is an intensely intellectual subject, one often directly or indirectly thought about by sincere Christians. But it sounds like an appeal to the head alone, which no doubt it is.

The First Baptist Church of New York City advertises its ponderous theological dogmas which its learned Doctor of Divinity elucidates as follows:

FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH
Broadway and 79th St.
PASTOR I. M. HALDEMAN, D.D.

11 A. M.—"Are the other worlds inhabited? The proof that they are. The visit and message from an inhabitant of one of these worlds to this. The marvellous sign he gave." (A Christmas sermon.)

8 P. M.—"Was Almighty God born into the world as a babe? Did God become a man that man might become a God?" (A Christmas Sermon.). Christmas music all day.

Surely that is a great deal for one Sunday of Christmas sermons. But if the truth is there, or the people think it is there, should it not be advertised to the limit?

Here is the Fifth Avenue Baptist church of that same city. They have another attraction, that perhaps no other Baptist church can have at the same time, and that is the advertisement that Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., will teach the Men's Class. Certainly

money talks. Do the men think he is an expert? In what? Why does it pay to advertise that Mr. Rockefeller will speak in a church of the Homeless Jew? Does this advertisement not mean that we are in a new world as advertised by our churches? And if the Fifth Avenue Baptist church believes Mr. Rockefeller is the type of the superman, it should advertise that fact, but why consider Jesus then as an example, or John the Baptizer?

The great Teacher was often advertised by physical cures, which he did not care to be used to substantiate his teachings, as the records imply. But then we have copies of copies of hearsay evidence, and this generation in its soul will not be satisfied unless it adventures into the unknown region and finds its own God of experience. So the Bible as the deposit of all truth once for all delivered to the saints, cannot be the unchanging foundation of the Twentieth Century man. That is, he has been thrust out of the forefather's house, and must build a tabernacle of his own. The intellectual impulse brings the intellectuals together, but the intellectuals cannot, or at least in the history of the world have never founded a religion, any more than the non-intellectuals can.

The people intensely in earnest are all advertisers, that is missionaries, and their advertisements of the gospel to the whole world is a test of their earnestness and love of their brethren.

When they have found what is to them, the pearl of great price, they are ingrates if they do not desire others to share in their good fortune. The method is not so important as the heart of compassion that is back of the message.

CARLYLE SUMMERBELL.

THE VIRTUOSO.

The curving breaker with cold, facile hands,
Is reaching out to play upon the sands.

Its rippling fingers in cadenzas run
Along the keyboard bleaching in the sun.

Like racing winds the measures seem to flow
With undertone of deep arpeggio.

In broken minor falls upon the ears,
The lilt of laughter and the sob of tears.

And when the song has reached its liquid end,
The secrets of the ocean with it blend,

And all the wonder of the sky and sea
Are wedded in triumphant harmony.

With all the magic of an artist's hands,
Those ripping fingers run along the sands.

The Bookman. —*Mabel J. Bourquin.*

There is no harm in anybody thinking that Christ is in bread. The harm is in the expectation that He is in gunpowder.—*Ruskin.*

These unspeakably stupid and contemptible local antipathies are inherited by civilized men from that far-off time when the clan system prevailed over the face of the earth, and the hand of every clan was raised against its neighbors. They are pale and evanescent survivals from the universal primitive warfare, and the sooner they die out from human society, the better for every one.—*John Fiske.*

Will Progressives Unite?

These are disquieting times for the radical whose hope of victory lies in the sense of the essential justice of his cause. The war-madness seems to have infected the ranks of the professed internationalist almost as much as it has the forces of imperialism. There are those of us with enlightened religious views who no longer hold any fatalistic creed which would make the coming of the Co-operative Commonwealth not only inevitable but also undelayable, yet who still firmly believe that this is a universe of law and that the right can triumph only through right means. Because we are unalterably opposed to the savagery of the Russian blockade and to the machiavellian intervention policy of our state department, it does not therefore follow that we endorse the program of Lenin. While fully aware of the lying propaganda that has been directed against the Bolsheviki, we have tried to keep our balance and our former conceptions of freedom and democracy. So, during the war, we refused to consider it a patriotic duty to believe every vile accusation brought against the ruling caste of Germany and to hold as an unquestionable article of the faith of a patriot the incorruptible saintliness of our own junkers and autocrats. There are certain principles of the faith of humanity that cannot be given up until we abandon the position that life is worth living and humanity worth saving. Now it seems to us that, just as the Wilsonites and Morganites on the one side have violated those axioms, so too on the other side the Leninists have also fallen victims to the Great Madness. The world is being again marshalled into two great war camps, threatened with another general appeal to the judgment of the sword, and civilization is in danger of the almost utter extinction of the faith that saves.

At first thought, too, the result of the late election seems altogether tragic: a brief alliance of the most irreconcilable elements in a blind protest against the monumental humbug of the ages. The result is Harding for President and the avowed champions of reaction to direct the affairs of our government. Yet, taking everything into consideration, we must admit that the people did very well. What else was there for them to do? Nine-tenths of them knew of Socialism only through the subsidized press, and had been taught to think of it as the deadly enemy of all decent human relationships. Besides that, after making all due allowances for lies and exaggerations, the average American estimates the Third International as a Moscow dictatorship, a call to world-wide civil war, to another drenching of the earth with blood, and he favors it just about as much as he does the bubonic plague. Furthermore he feels reasonably sure that the Socialist party in America is more or less committed to the program of the Third International. Then, too, there was the fear that by voting for any minor party the party of Wilson, Palmer and Burleson might be given another four years lease of power. Is it then to be wondered at that hundreds of thousands of socially-minded liberty-loving Americans voted for Harding as the best in an evil choice? Is it to be accounted strange that millions were so disheartened and so perplexed that they either could not or would not make any choice? Is it not marvelous that about two millions voted for Eugene Debs? The combined Socialist and Farmer-Labor vote could have carried several western states. Is there not every

evidence that there is still left a very large saving "remnant"? But the great problem of the immediate future is how to reach and mobilize that remnant for intelligent action.

I can speak from first-hand knowledge of the situation, having taken part in the campaign in three states and kept in touch with conditions in other sections. Plainly we are in need of a more mobile, practical, and at the same time idealistic expression of the best American political thought. The time has come for the constructive radical elements to unite to build the great party of American freedom, for the great issue is industrial democracy, and it cannot be much longer avoided.

Yet it is well nigh impossible to make much headway so long as injustice, oppression and plunder are unquestioningly allowed to masquerade in the garb of idealism, morality and religion. An alarming number of people are sinking into a hard cynicism—a most hopeless state—while the religious radicals do little more than talk. Is it not true of us religiously-minded radicals that we are often more fond of selfish self-expression than we are of putting the great essentials of our faith before the world? Is not that the reason why we divide on the issues of tweedle-dee and tweedle-dum and are unable to unite in a real forward movement?

But in view of the growing cynical unfaith, and of the aggressiveness of black reaction, the insistent question of the hour is, cannot some of the members of the radical religious organizations devise some agency, some broad Christian brotherhood, branches of which can be established in every community in the land, wherever five or six can be brought together to accept and spread our message of justice, peace and good-will to all? Can we not thus find a way to develop and use our missionary spirit and send out as organizers and speakers the hundreds of enlightened men who in the last few years have been driven out of the ministry by the pagan element in the church because they would not submit to having the image of the Beast set up in the holy place? Are there not thousands of others who would be glad to live a life of sacrifice for the sake of such a work? This is the great need and the great opportunity of the hour. Surely there are enough of us to find an effective way of fighting together for the good rather than merely railing at the ill or sitting like Elijah in his cave lamenting that, "I, even I only, am left." The seven thousand who have not bent the knee to Baal would make a pretty effective force working together for a single purpose.

ERNEST M. WHITESMITH.

REVOLUTION.

I thought the ruin of old schemes,
The falling down of ancient wrong,
Would make a theme for singing men,
The burden of a poet's song!

But oh! so swift and true they struck,
So keen their blade and great their trust,
The strongholds of oppression fell
In merest silence to the dust!

JAMES WALDO FAWCETT.

A Book a Week

Mary Badollet Powell Memorial

IS VIOLENCE THE WAY OUT OF OUR INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES? By John Haynes Holmes. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company.

I sat in a courtroom in Brooklyn one day several years ago and saw three magistrates, "wrapped in the black silk of a maiden-aunt," inflict the violence of a bad law on a frail little woman who had wilfully committed "a crime" in her effort to help to solve the great, world-threatening problem of rapidly increasing over-population. These three old men, with red noses, consulted together in whispers; they looked like the cartoons one sometimes sees of "predatory power." The fattest of the three at last turned to the prisoner and said:

"We want to be merciful, Mrs. Sanger, and if you'll promise not to give out any more of these pamphlets, you can go free—"

"I can't promise that," the woman answered quickly.

There was a pause for a moment, like the prologue to an explosion.

"Thirty days on the Island!" snapped the magistrate. His companions, fellow conspirators, bowed their shiny bald heads in approval.

There you are! That is the inevitable situation when the force of violence and the power of non-resistance meet. The woman refused to compromise, likewise declined to resist; she did not shriek or try to scratch the magistrate's face, she merely smiled. And because she was composed and smiling the three on the bench nearly burst, as it appeared, with indignation.

How small the court seemed then! How little were the judges, how little "the limbs of the Law!" One frail woman, steadfastly adhering to a great social ideal, put all the power and show of might to shame. The violence of coercion falls before the majesty of a thought. History provides the proof. All the things that represent brute force pass away. Ideas persist. The Pyramids crumble; the legend of the Queen of the Nile will live forever. "The singer dies, the song remains."

The idea of non-resistance is older than any man-made law in the world. Jesus carrying his own cross, the Son of God on the road to Calvary, submitting and yet not submitting, conquered but conquering; this is the most inspiring, the most *dangerous* spectacle this earth has ever seen.

It is not easy to review this book, for the reason probably that it was not easy to write this book. Dr. Holmes has done just what we should have liked some day to do, if we had had the genius, namely: written an answer to the challenge that shallow people have brought against social pacifism, and not only that but also a statement of the case from our angle as the philosopher would make it—not only a negation of a negation, but a positive declaration as well. He has answered our critics, but he has not stopped there. He has dared to put himself in his opponent's place, to try to see the problem as the other man sees it—a most difficult thing to do, a thing which bigots dare not attempt. He has been scrupulously just in dealing with his material, he has been more than just. He has given the militant and the capitalist every possible opportunity to answer back. He approaches the problem with a liberal mind. But he has his own convictions, and he states them with admirable can-

dor. He frankly wants labor to win, and he wants the victory clean and honorable. He wants the humane solution, humanely achieved. But he gives those who differ with him "a square deal." He understands them and helps them to plead; and he answers them without bitterness but without hedging. So it is that the book is a double-barreled book. Here are the social radical and the imaginary tory, and both are fairly dealt with. Not only that, however; for the book is not merely a debate. There is also the social philosopher present. He is a referee, a judge and an advisor. Having heard both sides, he tries to suggest a way out of the difficulty. The chances are that, in this world of exaggerations and extremes, neither party will listen generously. But the middle classes, whose sympathies are with labor, because they are workers, will listen, and for them, too, was the book written.

The masses of the people want labor to do something, not to fritter the generation away debating uselessly and quarreling about the details of social doctrine; and the most effective and economic way for labor to do what we all want it to do, namely: come into possession of the product of its toil, is the way of social pacifism. It is the power of the justice of labor's case, not the physical strength of some poor workman's fist, that will bring the victory. Capital can *fight* labor with machine guns, but it cannot *conquer* labor that way. Therein lies the key to the solution of the problem. Labor must "get together," forget all personal and factional differences, abandon the debate on the fine points of its several dogmas, and organize and educate men and women as *workers,* not as amateur philosophers. It will not take long to do this, for labor's cause makes a universal appeal; but it must all be done with love, even for the mistaken enemy, so that the cause may be clean and the purpose wholly honorable.

Capital, too, as Dr. Holmes shows convincingly, has something of a case, and deserves a hearing. And here, also, the principle of social pacifism holds the only possible peaceful solution. It is the capitalists like the Fords and the Ingersolls who share their profits with their employes who stand firmest in these days of trial and trouble. The old-fashioned "grinder of men"—many still exist—has little chance of winning out, for his employes hate him and will not admit the justice of his claims even when he is right. Capitalism is a ruined system because of the faults of capitalists, rather than because of the shortcomings of workmen. It was when capitalism ceased to be a *useful* social force that it fell. So long as capitalism *served* the society it enslaved there was no sign of its collapse. But, of course, the origin of its failures was synonymous with the origin of its successes; the same seed brought forth the United States Steel Corporation and the Ludlow massacre, the Carnegie libraries and Cabin Creek.

It is a truism that the dreadful thing about the possession of riches is the starvation of the soul that wealth invariably implies. No great militant capitalist has ever been a great philosopher, just as no great philosopher has ever been a militant capitalist. Getting money and material power is one thing, serving mankind is another. The Rockefeller Institute does not recompense the people for the evil done by the Standard Oil Company. If capitalism could be practiced for the benefit of all, rather than for the material benefit of a few, it might survive,—it would be a form of socialism.

But the instinct of the fighter is present in the make-up of every "captain of industry." The pirate and the magnate are of one character. This is not to say that a capitalist is necessarily a ruffian; our point is merely that under the surface there is always the spirit of the warrior,—the mercenary warrior, if you please. And it is here that the incipient tragedy arises.

The workers will become strong enough soon to take back the prize they have created and of which they have been robbed. On the day that they go forth to retrieve their treasure the machine guns will rattle like pebbles in a milk can. The capitalist is a coward under the skin; that is why he is a fighter,—and he will fight whether the workers reply in kind or not; he will mow them down without mercy, he won't surrender without a struggle. So it seems that the Social Revolution will be stained crimson with the blood of martyrs,—unless, of course, both sides will listen to the voice of reason *now* while there is yet time.

In the end capitalism will try violence; indeed capital is constantly trying violence, and the cause of capital suffers accordingly, for sooner or later the stolid, timid middle classes, naturally allied with labor, will pass judgment in the case; and since it is the middle classes who are most amenable to the moral argument, it will be a judgment in favor of pacific labor,—that is, of course, if labor *is* and *remains* pacific. In this matter labor has a much better record than its enemy. For the reason, perhaps, that capital has always protected itself by the Law, for which, strangely enough, labor has a profound respect, in spite of such incidents as the Mooney trial. Again, the means of violence have been, like the tools of industry, in possession of capital. It was once asserted that predatory power could not survive the invention of dynamite. It should not have survived that event, but it did. Let it be recorded in labor's favor that dynamite has been so little used in the struggle. The bomb to organs like *The New York Times* is a symbol, a symbol of a great fear. Capital knows what labor *might* do if it were so minded. Thus, on all possible occasions, capital accuses labor of doing it. The fear is father to the thought. It is said that Wolftone once declared he could win Ireland's struggle in forty-eight hours—by burning the city of London. That Ireland's cause has not been won by such methods is a tribute to the character of Ireland's partisans. Burning one great city after another would be a fiendish demonstration of belief in violence, but would it be effective? We can imagine terrified England rising from its ashes to swear eternal enmity to all things Irish. Ireland might be freed, but what sort of freedom would it be, how long would it last? The freedom of a people, the welfare of a nation, must be founded on the rock of honor, love, reason and justice. Otherwise, disaster is inevitable. Violence has no friends. It destroys those who employ it. It is the most cruel, the most inhuman force in the world. It is its own worst enemy. It answers its own arguments. Its victories are linked with death. Only a poor or a lost cause will dare to use it.

But the fact is that most, if not all, of us can find arguments to justify the use of violence if *our* purposes seem to require it. It is violence as practiced

by others that we all object to. Dr. Holmes says:

> It is the philosophy of nearly all of us that violence is all right provided it is used by ourselves in our wisdom, for the defense of interests which *we* regard as indispensable to human welfare.

And this is the reason why there are relatively so few who follow Christ and Tolstoy. For pacifism implies a certain quality of conscience, a certain spirit that only a few highly developed characters have as yet attained. To practice effective self-control in the sight of such a cruel exhibition as a grown man beating a small child with his fists, to resist the temptation to punish the man and rescue the child by the use of force, to avoid being only a little less cruel than the brute himself is about the most difficult thing in the world. Christ could not restrain himself when he saw the merchants (capitalists) in the temple; he used a whip.

But Dr. Holmes enunciates a doctrine which goes beyond the non-resistance that most of us practice when we hand over to the police the persons who offend us, thus freeing ourselves from the inconvenience of using personal violence if not from the responsibility for its use. The kind of social pacifism that he teaches is expressed in these words:

> I am a non-resistant. I am opposed to the use of violence by either an individual or a nation, under any circumstances however necessitous, for any purpose however beneficent. I am convinced today—more than ever since the tragic outcome of the Great War!—that force never accomplishes anything that is good, and always accomplishes much that is evil. * * * There is a better way to the peace, security, and happiness which are the dream of all our hearts.

Only a minority, albeit a priceless minority, will accept this creed and pledge adherence to this principle. Because only a very few characters are sufficiently developed. Most people will dissent from the idea that "force never accomplishes anything that is good," because most people *do* actually believe in killing, in the use of force, in various common forms of violence. If we believe in the necessity for government we believe in the use of force, for all government, in the common use of the word, rests on the soldier's rifle and the policeman's club, the cannon and the jail. If we believe in majority rule, we believe in force, for majority rule is only a polite synonym for force. If we believe in the practice of capital punishment, in *any* punishment, we believe in violence. If we accept any of the forms of "Law and order" we accept the righteousness of violence. This is the test, and most of us fail to pass.

But Dr. Holmes is right, and it is the majority of us who are wrong. The ideal is high, and most of us think we are too weak to reach it. The best that the majority will attempt is a partial acceptance of the non-resistant position. The vegetarian, for example, practices at least one part of the creed of pacifism. The conscientious objector goes further and inspires us all with the majesty of his stand. But whether or not we accept Dr. Holmes's creed in its entirety, we must agree with him that there *is* "a better way." The way of force is the way of war and waste. The way of love and reason *is* a better way. The way of peace *is* a better way.

To the degree that we, as nations, as classes and as individuals, choose to follow the better way, however hard; to the degree that we love and do not hate, that we reason and do not fight, we may be said to merit salvation. The clean, beautiful spirits really win life's struggle. And the spirit is like a priceless diamond; by constant polishing, by effort, education and experience, the real beauty of the gem, the real beauty of the soul is revealed.

Dr. Holmes's book is composed of three addresses, one to labor, one to capital and one to both. In these addresses he shows the historical background against which his argument moves. He then shows the lack of moral support for the use of violence; and, what seems to us most important in the circumstances, that violence does not "make good," that the struggle cannot be *won* by physical force, that the "meek inherit the earth," and that he who uses violence to advance his cause injures himself more than his enemy. In other words, violence is wrong, ethically and practically; it is wrong in the sense of conscience and wrong in the sense of tactics. "The terrible meek" is the winner in the end. "Christ the Swordless comes conquering down the centuries."

The third part of the book is that devoted to a discussion of the better way, and here it is that Dr. Holmes's constructive pacifism is at its best.

In the first place, he pleads for the abandonment of the traditional hostility of the classes, asks both parties to give up, at least for a time, their "class consciousness." He begs labor to see the position of capital with friendlier eyes, not for the sake of capital but solely for the sake of labor and humanity at large. Capitalists are also enslaved by the system, he says, and we must be generous enough to be willing to discern between the system and the man. He begs capital, too, to come down from its lofty pinnacle (or up from the mire?) and see labor as labor is, not as it has been imagined by the foolish and the wicked. "Men are to be trusted because they are men."

He asks both parties to be humane, to recognize the human element in the struggle. Then he appeals to them to go about the solution as brothers, not as savage foemen; as gentlemen, not as cut-throats. He asks them to get rid of their parochialisms and to see the whole matter in its largest aspect. He asks them to acquire the liberal attitude toward each other and toward their affairs. They must work not for themselves, but for everyone, everywhere. They must work not for today only, but for all time. In a word, they must try to see their problem in a Christian way, they must follow the teaching of Jesus, who loved all men.

The practical suggestions Dr. Holmes offers following this appeal are that capital should

> hand over, not to labor, but to that new democracy of industry in which both capital and labor were now merging their separate interests, all those powers and profits which it had been so long enjoying for itself alone.

Labor should

> consent to a guarantee of economic security to the generation now in control, and the new generation now awaiting the inheritance of control * * * which would make easy the transition to industrial democracy.

This is a solution which Dr. Holmes says he can well imagine if the two parties would come together as brothers to solve the great problem; and he supports his contention by citing the co-operative scheme of Robert Owen, established at New Lanark. "Make universal the co-operative spirit of employer and employe in this one instance, and our world would straightway become a kind of paradise on earth."

But Dr. Homes grants that the contending indus-

trial forces of our time will probably not move along this line of co-operation. The problem is bigger than the men concerned. There is another "better way." It includes:

the establishment of industrial courts for the hearing and settlement of disputes between capital and labor, exactly after the pattern of civil courts long since established for the hearing and settlement of disputes between capital and social life.

Such a court is a vital necessity, because "the secret of our problem" is "the substitution of the processes of justice for the brutalities of force." Of course, this is, in effect, merely a softening of the principle of violence, the replacing of one form of brutality by another less evil form, but it is a substantial gain and might eventually result in voluntary settlement of contested matters "outside court." Both parties would be obliged, of course, to abide by the decision of the industrial tribunal, an understanding which would involve the concession by capital of the right of collective bargaining and the closed shop and by labor of the right to strike.

But the solution of the problem is not to be found merely in the establishment of these industrial courts. The next step is:

the organization by labor of a political party pledged to its interests, dedicated to the accomplishment of its aims, and concerned with all methods of education, propaganda, and organization which properly belong to such a party.

"The Non-Partisan League has shown us the way." As the League has captured North Dakota, labor might effect the political conquest of every state by organizing the workers politically rather than in trade unions, by using the ballot instead of the strike. "Labor must learn the lesson of mass action, and apply it without flinching at the polls."

The third step in the organization of a co-operative system like that established in England and Russia, in Denmark and Ireland, that the element of profit may be removed from the production and distribution of the necessities of life. In other words, the construction of a co-operative industrial state within the limits of the present order.

In concluding, Dr. Holmes states his belief that the day has passed when the interests of capital and labor may be fairly said to be identical and declares:

We are all of us on one side or the other. We are either workers or idlers; we either live by our own labor or by the labor of someone else.

Further, he says:

Modern men are living less and less in political relations, and more and more in economic relations. Every hour the state is functioning less efficiently. * * * The political state * * * is gradually yielding its functions of control to the economic state.

The struggle

is going on until, by one method of another, labor is triumphant, and a complete new order of society established. * * * Capitalism, as we know it, can no more endure than political autocracy or chattel slavery. * * * There must be victory for labor, for not otherwise can the race advance.

Because labor *must* win, then, it is vitally necessary that its banner be kept stainless and clean.

Labor, with the very stars in their courses fighting on its side, would commit folly, as it would confess self-distrust, if it resorted to such weak and essentially petulant weapons as those of physical force. * * * The workers are today perhaps the one group of persons in all the world who can afford to bear all things, believe all things, hope all things, endure all things. For their cause, like love, can never fail!

The last word in the book is a plea to capital to surrender without insisting on a melodramatic last stand.

In the past, more often than not, great transformations of society have been purchased at the price of pain and much blood. This latest transformation, now impending, can be made to come in the same way, if capital so chooses, for it has the power, and can use it cruelly.

This seems to us the most important page of all, for the plea is so badly needed; and, it almost follows, will find so few who will heed it. Morgan, Rockefeller, Gary and Schwab are brothers-german to Kolchak, Yudenitch, Wrangel and Semenoff. They will resort to the same tactics in the end. They are not "good losers." But the choice is for them to make, it is squarely "up to them."

We agree with Dr. Holmes in his belief in the necessity of victory for labor. And we want labor to win grandly, nobly, magnanimously, with clear eyes and clean hands. The contrast between the victor and the vanquished will then be as that between Fujiyama and Vinegar Hill.

When we had finished reading this book we sat back in our easy chair to think it over, and two living pictures came into our mind.

The first scene was a great music hall. A band had been playing "Over There! Over There!"—that dreadful, shameless song. There were many flags. A great crowd was cheering. Then a man began to speak,—a tall man, with eyeglasses and gray hair and a prominent jaw. What was he saying? Listen! "Force, force, force to the utmost!" he cried. Ah, yes; we knew him. He was our President. He was talking about being very violent to some Germans whose government he did not like.

The second scene was a dusty, gilded courtroom. An old man was on the bench, glancing furtively from side to side. Another old man was talking, very quietly and gently, to twelve men in a jury box. His tall, loose-knit frame shook with emotion, with silent struggle nearly finished. He said: "From what you heard in the address of counsel for the prosecution, you might naturally infer that I am an advocate of force and violence. It is not true. I have never advocated violence in any form. I always believed in education, in intelligence, in enlightenment, and I have always made my appeal to the reason and to the conscience of the people." Who was this man who was speaking? Ah, yes; it was 'Gene Debs. He was opposed to war. Colonel Harvey says he is very *dangerous;* Colonel Harvey is right. Debs doesn't like our present government very well.

These two pictures are a striking contrast. The central figures are so different.

The sands of Time are falling. We see them again. One sits in a wheel-chair in a White House, secluded, hidden, sick, rejected, defeated, heart-broken, almost forgotten. Tears stream down his pale cheeks. "Force to the utmost!" The other sits on a poor cot in a stone cage, aged and ill—but—*loved,* oh loved so deeply, so preciously, by those who understand, more than a million Americans, men and women and *children,* with vision, with faith, with courage. He smiles, he *knows.* "I always believed in education."

The chimes of midnight. Tomorrow is another day.

JAMES WALDO FAWCETT.

THE FIELD

"The World is my country, to do good is my Religion"

A PROTEST AGAINST ANTI-SEMITISM.

We print herewith in full the following remarkable protest against the Anti-Semitic campaign now under way in this country. Mr. John Spargo, who prepared and circulated the document, points out that "no Jewish person or organization had anything to do with the preparation or publication of the protest," and that all the signers are non-Jews.

The undersigned, citizens of Gentile birth and Christian faith, view with profound regret and disapproval the appearance in this country of what is apparently an organized campaign of anti-Semitism, conducted in close conformity to and co-operation with similar campaigns in Europe. We regret exceedingly the publication of a number of books, pamphlets and newspaper articles designed to foster distrust and suspicion of our fellow-citizens of Jewish ancestry and faith—distrust and suspicion of their loyalty and their patriotism.

These publications, to which wide circulation is being given, are thus introducing into our national political life a new and dangerous spirit, one that is wholly at variance with our traditions and ideals and subversive of our system of government. American citizenship and American democracy are thus challenged and menaced. We protest against this organized campaign of prejudice and hatred, not only because of its manifest injustice to those against whom it is directed, but also, and especially, because we are convinced that it is wholly incompatible with loyal and intelligent American citizenship. The logical outcome of the success of such a campaign must necessarily be the division of our citizens along racial and religious lines, and, ultimately, the introduction of religious tests and qualifications to determine citizenship.

The loyalty and patriotism of our fellow citizens of the Jewish faith is equal to that of any part of our people, and requires no defense at our hands. From the foundation of this Republic down to the recent World War, men and women of Jewish ancestry and faith have taken an honorable part in building up this great nation and maintaining its prestige and honor among the nations of the world. There is not the slightest justification, therefore, for a campaign of anti-Semitism in this country.

Anti-Semitism is almost invariably associated with lawlessness and with brutality and injustice. It is also invariably found closely intertwined with other sinister forces, particularly those which are corrupt, reactionary and oppressive.

We believe it should not be left to men and women of Jewish faith to fight this evil, but that it is in a very special sense the duty of citizens who are not Jews by ancestry or faith. We therefore make earnest protest against this vicious propaganda, and call upon our fellow citizens of Gentile birth and Christian faith to unite their efforts to ours, to the end that it may be crushed. In particular, we call upon all those who are molders of public opinion—the clergy and ministers of all Christian churches, publicists, teachers, editors and statesmen—to strike at this un-American and un-Christian agitation.

Signed:

WOODROW WILSON.
WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT.
WILLIAM CARDINAL O'CONNELL.
LYMAN ABBOTT, *Editor "The Outlook."*
JANE ADDAMS, *Social Worker.*
JOHN G. AGAR, *Lawyer.*
NEWTON D. BAKER, *Secretary of War.*
RAY STANNARD BAKER, *Author.*
CHARLES A. BEARD,
Author and Educator.
JAMES M. BECK, *Lawyer.*
BERNARD I. BELL,
President St. Stephen's College.
ARTHUR E. BESTOR,
President Chautauqua Institution.
ALBERT J. BEVERIDGE,
Former U. S. Senator.
W. E. B. DUBOIS, *Editor "The Crisis."*
MABEL T. BOARDMAN,
Commissioner D. of C.
EVANGELINE BOOTH,
Commander Salvation Army.
BENJAMIN BREWSTER,
Bishop of Maine.
CHAUNCEY B. BREWSTER,
Bishop of Connecticut.
JEFFREY R. BRACKETT, *Social Worker.*
HORACE J. BRIDGES, *Ethical Teacher.*
WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN,
Ex-U. S. Secretary of State.
HENRY BRUERE, *Financial Expert.*
NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER,
President Columbia University.
BAINBRIDGE COLBY, *Secretary of State.*
GEORGE W. COLEMAN,
President National Council of Forums.
ALICE B. COLEMAN,
(Mrs. George W.),
Club Worker.
PAUL D. CRAVATH, *Lawyer.*
GEORGE CREEL,
Former Chairman U. S. Committee on Public Information.
SAMUEL McCHORD CROTHERS,
Clergyman.
R. FULTON CUTTING, *Financier.*
OLIVE TILFORD DARGAN, *Poet.*
CLARENCE DARROW, *Lawyer.*
JAMES R. DAY, *University Chancellor.*
HENRY S. DENNISON, *Manufacturer.*
JAMES DUNCAN,
First Vice-President A. F. of L.
ROBERT ERSKINE ELY,
Director Civic Forum.
CHARLES P. FAGNANI, *Theologian.*
W. H. P. FAUNCE,
President Brown University.
DOROTHY CANFIELD FISHER,
Novelist.
IRVING FISHER, *Economist.*
JOHN FORD, *Jurist.*
RAYMOND B. FOSDICK, *Lawyer.*
ROBERT FROST, *Poet.*
JAMES R. GARFIELD, *Lawyer.*
H. A. GARFIELD,
President Williams College.
LINDLEY M. GARRISON,
Former U. S. Secretary of War.
JOHN PALMER GAVIT,
Editor "New York Evening Post."
HERBERT ADAMS GIBBONS, *Historian.*
CHARLES DANA GIBSON, *Artist.*
FRANKLIN H. GIDDINGS,
University Professor.
MARTIN H. GLYNN,
Ex-Governor New York.
GEORGE GRAY, *Jurist.*
EDWARD EVERETT HALE,
University Professor.
JAMES HARTNESS,
Governor of Vermont.
PATRICK J. HAYES,
Archbishop of New York.
JOHN GRIER HIBBEN,
President Princeton University.
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Clergyman.*
JESSE H. HOLMES,
President National Federation of Religious Liberals.
HAMILTON HOLT,
Editor "The Independent."
ERNEST MARTIN HOPKINS,
President Dartmouth College.
FREDERIC C. HOWE, *Publicist.*
HENRY C. IDE, *Diplomatist.*
INEZ HAYNES IRWIN, *Author.*
WILL IRWIN, *Author.*
GEORGE R. JAMES, *Capitalist.*
DAVID STARR JORDAN, *Scientist.*
WILLIAM W. KEEN,
Professor of Surgery.
PAUL U. KELLOGG,
Editor "The Survey."
WILLIAM SERGEANT KENDALL,
Artist.
GEORGE KENNAN, *Journalist.*
HENRY CHURCHILL KING,
President Oberlin College.
DARWIN P. KINGSLEY,
President New York Life Insurance Company.
W. P. LADD,
Dean Berkeley Divinity School.
IRA LANDRITH, *Prohibition Advocate.*
FRANKLIN K. LANE,
Former U. S. Secretary of the Interior.
ROBERT LANSING,
Former U. S. Secretary of State.
JULIA C. LATHROP,
Chief Children's Bureau, U. S. Dept. of Labor.
BEN B. LINDSEY, *Juvenile Court Judge.*
CHARLES H. LEVERMORE,
Peace Advocate.
FREDERICK LYNCH, *Clergyman.*
EDWIN MARKHAM, *Poet.*
Mrs. EDWIN MARKHAM, *Writer.*
DANIEL GREGORY MASON,
Musical Composer.
JOSEPH ERNEST McAFEE,
Religious Publicist.
J. F. McELWAIN, *Manufacturer.*
RAYMOND McFARLAND,
Principal Vermont Academy.
ALEXANDER R. MERRIAM, *Theologian.*
E. T. MEREDITH,
Secretary U. S. Dept. of Agriculture.
JAMES F. MINTURN, *Judge.*
JOHN MOODY, *Financial Expert.*
WILLIAM FELLOWES MORGAN,
Financier.
CHARLES CLAYTON MORRISON,
Editor "The Christian Century."
PHILIP STAFFORD MOXOM,
Clergyman.
JOSEPH FORT NEWTON, *Clergyman.*
D. J. O'CONNELL, *Bishop of Richmond.*
MARY BOYLE O'REILLY, *Publicist.*
GEORGE WHARTON PEPPER, *Lawyer.*
LOUIS F. POST,
Assistant Secretary of Labor U. S.
THEODORE ROOSEVELT,
Member of New York Legislature.
CHARLES EDWARD RUSSELL,
Publicist.
JACOB GOULD SCHURMAN, *Educator.*
VIDA D. SCUDDER, *University Professor.*
SAMUEL SEABURY, *Jurist.*
THOMAS J. SHAHAN,
Rector of the Catholic University of America.
CHARLES M. SHELDON,
Editor "The Christian Herald."
EDWIN E. SLOSSON,
Associate Editor The Independent.
PRESTON SLOSSON, *Journalist.*
JOHN SPARGO, *Author.*
ROBERT E. SPEER,
President Federal Council of Churches.
CHARLES STELZLE, *Religious Publicist.*
PAUL MOORE STRAYER,
Clergyman.
MARION TALBOT, *University Dean.*
IDA M. TARBELL, *Author.*
HARRY F. WARD, *Theological Professor.*
EVERETT P. WHEELER, *Lawyer.*
GAYLORD S. WHITE, *Social Worker.*
GEORGE W. WICKERSHAM,
Ex-Attorney General of U. S.
CHARLES DAVID WILLIAMS,
Bishop of Michigan.
CHARLES ZUEBLIN,
Writer and Lecturer.

APPEAL FOR NECESSITOUS UNITARIAN CHILDREN IN BUDA PESTH.

The Committee of the International Union of Liberal Christian Women asked the Rev. Frederick Hankinson (minister of Kentish Town Unitarian Chapel) to report to them on his return to Buda Pesth as to the possibilities of helping sick or necessitous children of Unitarian families in that town, either by sending them to homes in the country or by extra food and clothing in their homes. Mr. Hankinson has already been working in Buda Pesth with the Friends' Relief Mission for six months,

and has now returned for a further six months' work. He has organized the work through a committee of the Women's League connected with Pastor Jozan's Church in Buda Pesth. There are in addition to the residents in the town a large number of Transylvanian refugees, about 7,000 of whom are living in the cattle or goods trucks in which they travelled thither, and in some of these wagons there have been living, for as long as eighteen months, many children. Some of these have no parents and no one to look after them and live from hand to mouth, as they can. Mrs. Piggott, who visited Buda Pesth last August, reported that these children are in dire need of clothing, food, education, and moral guidance, and were rapidly deteriorating for want of aid. In a letter dated November 19, 1920, Mr. Hankinson writes:—

"The Committee of the Women's League (of Buda Pesth) was urged by me to take a very active part this winter in alleviating the distress and illness in the city. It is not possible for them to give much monetary assistance or even many of the necessities of clothing or food, but if only they realized their responsibilities to their Unitarian brethren in the Church and among the Refugees (especially the wagon dwellers), they know I would do all I could to relieve cases of distress. It ought to be our privilege to work together as English and Hungarian Unitarians and at least see to our own comrades. Last week I was visiting the large Tuberculous Sanatorium, and a little boy called out he knew me. Then the Doctor explained he was a little Unitarian boy, who was being paid for by our Unitarian money, and it is good to report that a complete cure will result. His brother and sister had been very delicate but had benefited immensely by a stay at a Convalescent Home at Lake Bolaton. They were also paid for by money sent to me through Unitarian channels. Mrs. Chitty's gift of £5 (9,000 kronen!) will make it possible for me to carry on this special work among wagon dwellers, and to-day the Unitarian Women's League were asked to keep a very strict watch over the children of our Church who might need special care owing to underfeeding or delicate health and then to report to me at once. They are also to report to me about any of those unfortunate children, who in this cold season must live in a railway truck. It is terrible to contemplate and only those who can see with the actual eye have any impression of the degradation of such an existence and of the injury to innocent childhood. Much could be done if only the money was forthcoming, and it is needless to paint harrowing pictures or relate sordid stories. Just meditate for a short time upon the situation and realize it is colder here in November than in the winter days in England, that the cold becomes more intense during December, January and February, and that the dwelling is just a draughty wooden cattle or goods truck, and surely human pity will bring a response to my appeal.

Every lover of children must be touched by this appeal and we confidently beg all our friends to send us money for this object. Every penny will go direct to aid the children and all money received this week will be in Mr. Hankinson's hands, and can be expended by him, within a few days of our receiving it.

The Committee of the International Union think that the money will go further if used out in Hungary. For instance Mr. Hankinson was able to send two children away for a fortnight to a Convalescent Home for the equivalent of £1. This seems to us less expensive than receiving the children in our own homes here. The exchange is in our favor (last week it was 1 £ = 1,800 kr.): the winter is upon us, and the need *very* urgent.

All contributions and all inquiries should be sent to Mrs. Bernard Allen, 14 Gainsborough Gardens, Hampstead, London, N.W.3. Parcels should continue to be sent to the Friends' Relief Committee, 5 New Street Hill, E.C.4.

Helen Brooke Herford,
Secretary, International Union.
Rose Allen, *Treasurer.*

Schumann & Company

Cleaners of

FANCY GOWNS AND KID GLOVES

Having winter garments cleaned before storing them will keep out moth

PHONE DREXEL 231
ALL DEPARTMENTS

Main Office and Works
3954 Cottage Grove Avenue

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS

728 E. 39th Street
Phone Douglas 244

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES

Everything in HARDWARE
AT
PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

WRIGHT & COMPANY
STEAM—DOMESTIC
COAL
TELEPHONE WABASH 5028
Main Office:
28 E. Jackson Blvd.
CHICAGO

Subscribe for and read UNITY —do not miss a single number!

The Blakely-Oswald Printing Co.
PRINTERS and BINDERS
Telephone Wabash 3854 120-124 W. Polk St., CHICAGO

Bowman Dairy Company
MILK BOTTLED IN THE COUNTRY
Milk Cream Butter Buttermilk
DO OUR WAGONS SERVE YOU?
WHY NOT HAVE THE BEST?
4221-4229 State Street Telephones at all Division Offices
EVANSTON CHICAGO OAK PARK